TEACHING EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUES TO COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

ADRIANA GARCIA MCEACHERN

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1989

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother and father who have provided emotional as well as financial support throughout my college career, and to Abuela, who at the age of 92 is alive to see my dream become a reality. Special acknowledgements are extended to my husband, Michael, and my three children, Greg, Alix, and Renee, who have been very understanding and patient during this project.

Special recognition is extended to the following friends who offered their encouragement and contributed their resources and time to assist me with this dissertation: Edesa Acosta, Caryn Aslesson, Dix Aslesson, Lisa Winslow, Orlando Buch, Mark Phillips, George Edmondson, Liz Wysong, Gail Kennedy, and John Nestor.

Finally, my sincerest gratitude and appreciation are extended to Dr. Joe Wittmer, who motivated me to complete my doctoral studies. Without his assistance and support I would not have been able to write these acknowledgments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		ii
ABSTRACT		v
CHAPTERS		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Need for the Study	6
	Purpose of the Study	7
	Definition of Terms	7
	Organization of the Study	10
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
	Factors Affecting the Employment Interview	11
	The Employment Interview and College Recruitment	17
	Methods of Teaching Employment Interviewing Techniques	20
	Conclusion	25
III	METHODOLOGY	27
	Relevant Variables	27
	Population	28
	Sampling Procedure and the Resultant Sample	29
	Procedure and Methodology	29
	Description of Training	33
	Description of Instructional Methods	35
	Instrumentation	37
	Experimental Hypotheses	41
	Data Analyses	43
IV	RESULTS	45
	Sample	46
	Findings Related to Null Hypotheses	51

Page

V SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION..... 66

Limitations 67
Discussion of Results 69
Conclusions 71
Implications 72
Recommendations for Further Study 73

APPENDICES

A EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW RATING SCALE 75

B ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW MEMORANDUM..... 79

C LETTER TO SUBJECTS 81

D INFORMED CONSENT FORM 83

E STUDENT EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEWING INSTRUCTIONS..... 85

F STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE 87

G RETENTION QUESTIONNAIRE 89

H INTERVIEWER'S QUESTIONS 92

I RATER GLOSSARY 94

J STUDENT HANDOUT: THE FOUR STAGES OF THE EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW..... 97

K DESCRIPTION FO TREATMENTS 99

L LETTER ASKING PERMISSION FROM JOURNAL OF COLLEGE PLACEMENT..... 102

M EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW RATING SCALE RECRUITERS' SAMPLE 102

REFERENCES..... 109

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 117

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

TEACHING EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUES TO COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

Adriana Garcia McEachern

August 1989

Chairman: P. Joseph Wittmer
Major Department: Counselor Education

The purpose of this study was to compare the effects of three, one-half hour instructional approaches that could be used by career and placement counselors to teach college students employment interviewing skills. The three treatment approaches were (a) counselor-led instruction, (b) microcomputer-assisted instruction, and (c) videotaped instruction. The Employment Interview Rating Scale (EIRS), was developed by the investigator to measure the verbal and non-verbal behaviors of the subjects during videotaped, mock employment interviews following their participation in the treatments. The EIRS was also used to determine whether subjects' verbal and non-verbal behaviors were related to the hiring decisions of interviewers. A Retention Questionnaire was administered to the subjects to assess

information retained during instruction. A control group provided data for comparisons.

Analyses of variance and correlational analyses were used to evaluate the null hypotheses. The results revealed that none of the three instructional methods was more effective than the others in teaching employment interviewing skills to college students. However, the group receiving videotape instruction retained significantly more information than the other groups. A significant relationship was also found between the hiring decisions of interviewers conducting face-to-face interviews and those of independent raters viewing videotape interviews.

The use of videotape methods can be effective tools for career placement counselors in helping students to learn and retain information about the employment interview. Videotaping recruitment interviews also can assist interviewers in making hiring decisions when recruiting on college campuses.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Job placement of graduates is one of the most important services provided by career placement service centers on college and university campuses. For most students, post graduation job placement is the primary purpose for attending a college or university. Most colleges and universities operate placement programs which function to assist students in obtaining employment as well as to teach them employment interviewing techniques.

Representatives from many of the major corporations and governmental agencies visit college campuses regularly to interview and recruit graduating students. Competition for these positions may be keen, and recruiters seek to select those candidates whom they believe to be the top applicants for the positions available. Thus good employment interviewing techniques are crucial to graduates so that they can compete effectively and successfully.

The employment interview has always been the most widely used method of personnel selection (Cohen & Etheredge, 1975; Drake, Kaplan, & Stone, 1972) and is widely used by college recruiters. Often, student applicants must

participate in several interviews before final hiring decisions are completed. Therefore students not only must have academic credentials needed to compete for top positions, but also must be able to convince corporate recruiters they are the "best" persons for the jobs. The student who is best prepared to answer recruiters' questions during an employment interview often obtains a desired position (Roderick, 1985). Knowing how to interview effectively is, therefore, the crucial first step for a college graduate seeking employment. It follows that college students must develop interviewing skills which will persuade prospective employers to hire them.

College students typically rely on university career and/or placement counselors for information and instruction in employment interviewing techniques. Various educational methods can be used by these counselors to prepare students for employment interviewing. Walker (1974) advocated traditional didactic methods of instruction such as lectures followed by group discussion. However, the use of videotaped, (role playing) mock interviews has become more prevalent with the availability of videotape equipment (Gilmore, 1973; Kiradjieff & Stimac, 1975). The most recent advancement is the use of microcomputer-assisted programs which provide career information and assist students in exploring occupational possibilities (Vacc & Loesch, 1987). Because the above-mentioned are the three methods most

commonly used, the focus of this study was to investigate which of them is the most effective in teaching employment interviewing techniques to college students about to graduate.

Statement of the Problem

Although it is rare for anyone to be hired without a prior interview, very few college student interviewees actually know how to present themselves effectively in employment interviews (Shemetulskis, 1984). Further, many students who initially seek assistance from placement centers are unaware of the requirements of employment interviews. Thus, many college students who possess good academic qualifications are rejected following employment interviews (Austin & Vines, 1980).

Facing the first challenge in the job-seeking process, graduating students often feel overwhelmed, unprepared, threatened, and lacking in confidence in professional abilities and skills (Cohen & Etheredge, 1975). These negative characteristics inhibit students' abilities to communicate effectively in employment interviews. Unfortunately, however, it has been found that an applicant's ability to communicate in an employment interview correlates positively with a recruiter's likelihood to hire the applicant (Tschirgi, 1973).

Most college students simply do not know what type of responses or behavior will influence interviewers to employ them (Tschirgi, 1973). Furthermore, placement officials, faculty members, and/or advisors often may misinform students about employers' hiring criteria (Hafer & Hoth, 1980). Thus students participating in employment interviews are often ill-prepared to do so.

Along with the candidate's academic preparation and performance, other factors such as the behavioral characteristics and mannerisms displayed in the interview can influence the hiring or referral decision (Cohen & Etheredge 1975; Hollandsworth, Kazelskis, Stevens, & Dressel, 1979). For example, Cohen and Etheredge (1975) investigated the types of behavior which caused job interviewers to refer or reject student applicants for positions. They concluded that college recruiters, "attend to verbal and non-verbal mannerisms, general appearance, and personal motives in the interview, and that negative performance or its absence, principally affects the recruitment decision" (Cohen & Etheredge, 1975, p. 77).

College recruiters often believe college students pending graduation are generally unprepared for recruitment interviews (Garis & Hess, 1985). Stanley Haude, personnel supervisor for advertising at Procter and Gamble stated, "even the top students we see do not have enough

self-confidence and are reluctant to merchandise their background during the interview" (Garis & Hess, 1985, p. 31). Other researchers have suggested that along with the ability to communicate, factors such as personal attractiveness (Dipboye, Arvey, & Terspstra, 1977), fluency of speech (Hollandsworth, Dressel, & Stevens, 1977), smiling, maintaining good eye contact (Wexley, Fugita, & Malone, 1975), intelligence and competence (Hopper & Williams, 1973) also influence recruiters' hiring decisions.

It has been found that effective employment interviewing techniques can be taught (Azrin & Philips, 1979; Hollandsworth, Dressel, & Stevens, 1977; Mathews, Damron, & Yuen, 1985; Mathews, Whang, & Fawcett, 1984). Providing students with information about the employment interview process is one aspect of effective instruction as is allowing students to practice learned skills and critique their behavior (Austin & Vines, 1980). Several methods to teach individuals appropriate employment acquiring behaviors have been developed including behavioral instruction (Hollandsworth et al., 1979; Mathews & Fawcett, 1984), the Azrin Job Club method (Azrin & Philip, 1979), workshops or seminars (Mathews, Damron, & Yuen, 1985), and videotape instruction (Austin & Vines, 1980). Austin and Vines (1980) cited a review of the employment literature by Galassi and Galassi wherein 13 studies on interview training were identified. Austin and Vines (1980) concluded that "these

studies investigated the effectiveness of various training programs but were unable to find a single most effective method" (p. 60). Therefore, in this study a comparison was made of the effectiveness of three methods used to teach employment interviewing techniques to college students: (a) counselor-led instruction, (b) microcomputer-assisted instruction, and (c) videotape instruction.

Need for the Study

In view of the problems noted, research is needed to identify and verify characteristics and behavior which effect recruiters'/interviewers' hiring decisions. Also, additional research to compare methods of training students in employment interviewing is needed so that college career and placement counselors can prepare college students most effectively and efficiently for employment interviews. Although interviewee characteristics such as appearance, attitude, and communication facility have been identified, "there is a paucity of research regarding effective methods of helping college students to develop, and to manifest these desired interview behaviors" (Austin & Vines, 1980, p. 58).

Hollandsworth, Dressel, and Stevens (1977) researched the use of behavioral versus traditional methods for increasing job interview skills. They suggested that "neither a straight behavioral nor a straight discussion

model is most effective" (p. 508). Identification of training methods which effectively educate students to conduct successful interviews would better assist placement counselors in improving the quality of services offered to college students. Ultimately such training should make a difference in the employment rate of students on college campuses throughout the country.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the effects of three training approaches used to teach college students employment interviewing techniques. The three approaches investigated were (a) counselor-led instruction, (b) microcomputer-assisted instruction, and (c) videotape instruction. The effects assessed were (a) the verbal and non-verbal behavioral dimension subscales of the Employment Interview Rating Scale (EIRS), (b) the amount of information retained by the college students following the instruction, and (c) the hiring decisions of the interviewers and the raters.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are provided to assist in understanding the terminology used in this study:

Behavioral characteristics are verbal and non-verbal human responses displayed during employment interviews.

College students are individuals studying at institutions of higher learning that offer degrees at the associate, bachelor, and graduate levels.

Counselor-led instruction is an educational group instructional method facilitated by a career counselor with the primary objective of teaching individuals employment interviewing techniques and appropriate interviewing behavior (i.e., employability skills). Specifically, the instruction consisted of the information presented in the Four Stages of Interviewing, the videotape, and the microcomputer program developed by Career Development Software (1979).

Employment interview, job interview, or recruitment interview is an interrogative process whereby an employer representative assesses job applicant's behavioral characteristics and obtains information about an applicant's qualifications, personality, self-esteem, and how well she or he matches the specifications of the position. The process may also involve the applicant's investigation of the requirements of the position, company, salary, and benefits.

Employment Interview Rating Scale (EIRS) is a Likert-type checklist containing descriptive behavioral items of verbal and non-verbal behavior generally displayed by applicants in employment interviews.

Hiring decision reflects the choice to offer or not offer employment to an applicant following a series of one or more employment interviews.

Interviewer is an individual who conducts employment interviews and has the authority to make hiring decisions.

Job placement is the part of the process of career planning that teaches individuals how to translate career goals into a plan of action designed to satisfy predefined objectives with a realistic perspective of the world of work. Job placement involves an integration of an individual's self-concept and existing career options (Powell & Kirts, 1980).

Microcomputer-assisted instruction means instructional methods which utilize a microcomputer to interact with the student in the learning process.

Rater is an individual who evaluated the behavior of interviewees during the videotaped, mock job interview.

Retention Questionnaire is a 10-item, multiple choice questionnaire covering the major points in the "Four Stages of Interviewing" (Career Development Software Inc., 1979).

Role-playing refers to a method of practicing skills by pretending to act out an activity (e.g., an employment interview).

Videotaped instruction is defined as instructional methods using television to transmit information to individuals.

Organization of the Study

The remaining chapters of this study will focus on the problem discussed in Chapter I. A review of the related literature is presented in Chapter II. Chapter III contains descriptions of the methodology and instrumentation used in the study, and Chapter IV contains data and results. In Chapter V, the findings and conclusions are discussed.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An employment interview is generally a 15- to 30-minute session wherein an interviewer makes an assessment of the applicant's qualifications, background, career goals, and suitability for the position (Grundfest, 1985). The interview has been studied for more than 60 years in an effort to determine its reliability and validity as a tool for making hiring decisions (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Shemetulski, 1984). Yet in spite of its questionable reliability, validity, and susceptibility to bias and distortion, it continues to be the most widely used method of employee selection (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Lumsden & Sharf, 1974; Ulrich & Trumbo, 1965).

Factors Affecting the Employment Interview

Prior to the 1960s, researchers investigated the employment interview from an organizational perspective; however, subsequent to that time, closer attention has been given to those factors believed to influence interviewers' perceptions and hiring decisions (Feldman & Arnold, 1987). Arvey and Campion (1982), in the latest review of the

employment literature, divided these factors into three categories:

> (a) applicant characteristics (b) situational influences, and (c) the interviewer's characteristics; Applicant characteristics include age, sex, race, physical appearance, the applicant's educational and work background, career interests, attitude, intelligence, motivation, prior interviewing experience, perceptions of the interviewer, company or position, verbal and non-verbal behavior. (Arvey & Campion, 1986, p. 283)

Applicant non-verbal behaviors, such as smiling, gesturing, and maintaining eye contact with the interviewer have all been associated with the interviewer's attitude toward the applicant (Goodall & Goodall, 1982; Hakel & Washburn, 1973). Tessler and Sushelsky (1978) found that, in general, an applicant was perceived as less confident by an interviewer when the applicant did not maintain any eye contact during an interview. Tshirgi (1973) linked non-verbal behavior displayed in the interview with the applicant's level of confidence, assertiveness, motivation, and enthusiasm, and found that business recruiters ranked communication skills displayed by the applicant as the most important factor affecting their hiring decisions. Conversely, excess applicant non-verbal communication during the interview has been shown to have a negative effect. Baron (1986) found that the use of self-presentational tactics (i.e., the emission of many positive nonverbal cues by the applicant), particularly in excess, may serve as a source of bias, and distortion in the interview process.

The physical attractiveness of job candidates can have a positive influence on interviewers' hiring decisions (Gilmore, Beehr, & Love, 1986). Moreover, applicants' handicaps have also been found to affect the hiring decisions of interviewers. Arvey (1979), in his review of four studies dealing with handicapped applicants, revealed that handicapped applicants received lower hiring evaluations by interviewers but higher evaluations on motivational variables.

Intelligence has been identified as an applicant characteristic that can be estimated reliably and validly through the interview process (Hanna, 1950; Sperber & Adlerstein, 1961; Wagner, 1949). Additionally, intelligence and competence correlated positively with a favorable hiring decision in a study conducted by Hopper and Williams (1973).

The manner and length of applicants' questions can sway the opinion of interviewers. Most applicant questions tend to be closed, singular in form, containing about nine words and not typically phrased in the first person actual case (Babbitt & Jablin, 1985). Furthermore, applicants who receive second interview offers by interviewers tend to ask fewer questions phrased in the first person than applicants who do not receive hiring offers (Babbitt & Jablin, 1985).

Situational influences affecting the employment interview have been attributed to the following: "(a) political, legal, and economic forces in the marketplace and

organization; (b) the role of the interview in the selection system; (c) the selection ratio; (d) physical setting; and (e) interview structure" (Arvey & Campion, 1982, p. 283). In recent reviews of the literature, research conducted on the reliability of the structured interview versus an unstructured interview approach have been reported (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Goodall & Goodall, 1982; Mayfield, 1964). Structuring the interview refers to the use of similar key questions (Cohen & Etheredge, 1975). In an unstructured interview, the interviewer, rather than the interviewee, dominates the conversation (Anderson, 1960). Researchers seem to agree that structured interviews provide higher inter-rater reliability than do non-structured interviews (Mayfield, 1964). Mayfield (1964) recommended using a moderately structured interview format and assuring the interviewer be trained in interviewing techniques prior to conducting an actual interview.

Ulrich and Trumbo (1965), in their review of the employment interview literature, cited several aspects related to the role of the interview in the selection process. They recommended researchers study the usefulness of the interview and suggested that the information obtained from the interview be examined separately from the information gained from other sources such as employment tests. Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) also supported Mayfield's (1964) and Wagner's (1949) recommendations that using a

structured approach when conducting the employment interview is most effective.

The length of the employment interview has been viewed as important by researchers. Researchers have conducted studies of interviews lasting from 10 minutes to 2 hours (Bugental, 1953; Tullar, Mullins & Caldwell, 1979). Tullar, et al. (1979), in studying the effects of interview length (15 minutes vs. 30 minutes) on interviewer decision time, found that the more lengthy the interview the longer it took for the interviewer to make a decision. However, regardless of the length of the interview, the researchers indicated that the interviewer generally makes an impression of the interviewee, and reaches a decision within the first 4 minutes of the interview (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Springbett, 1958).

Investigating the effects of the interviewer's characteristics on an applicant's perceptions and on interview outcome has been of interest to several researchers (Liden & Parsons, 1986; Rynes, Heneman, & Schwab, 1980; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976). Arvey and Campion (1982) categorized interviewer characteristics as including

> (a) the age, race, and sex of the interviewer; (b) physical appearance; (c) psychological characteristics (i.e., attitude, intelligence, and motivation); (d) experience and training as an interviewer; (e) perceptions of job requirements; (f) prior knowledge of the applicant; (g) goals for the interview; and (h) verbal and non-verbal behavior. (Arvey & Campion, 1982, p. 283)

The interviewee's perceptions of the interviewer's behavior has been shown to influence the outcome of the employment interview. For example, the interviewer's behaviors during the employment interview may be interpreted by applicants as cues or signals of their chances of being offered employment (Rynes et al., 1980; Rynes & Miller, 1983). Liden and Parsons (1986) found that the "personableness" of the interviewer can strongly influence applicant perceptions. Most recently, the results of the research conducted by Feldman and Arnold (1987) concluded that "recruiters' behaviors do have an impact on job applicant perceptions and reactions, but that these reactions may be less far-ranging than has been previously believed" (p. 28). The results of this study also indicated that the negative or positive aspects of a particular job have had a greater impact on the applicant's acceptance of the job offer than the recruiter's behaviors (Feldman & Arnold, 1987).

Arvey and Campion (1982), in their review of the employment interview research, cited a study conducted by Wanous in 1980, wherein he advocated the importance of interviewers providing job candidates with accurate information so as to help create realistic expectations of the job. Moreover, interviewers tended to make different hiring decisions after listening to the same job interviews because each time they listened, they paid attention to

different information presented by the interviewees (Mayfield, 1964).

The Employment Interview and College Recruitment

As a selection device, the recruitment interview, defined as "an appraisal process in which the recruiter observes various applicant behaviors that prompt a referral decision," continues to provide an important link between colleges and the nation's employers (Cohen & Etheredge, 1975, p. 75). The interview is the first step in the selection process leading to eventual employment for the college graduates but is viewed by many of them as a "threat" since so much depends on it (Cohen & Etheredge, 1975).

College students facing the challenge of obtaining professional positions upon graduation will face one or more interviews prior to actually being hired. Therefore, college students today must know how to conduct effective interviews and face the interviewee role with some degree of confidence. However, few college students are prepared to conduct an effective interview as college recruiters report that "the most flagrant mistake committed by student applicants [is] an apparent failure to adequately prepare themselves for the interview experience" (Tschirgi, 1973, p. 77). Shemetulskis (1984) maintained that prospective applicants must "sell" themselves to convince interviewers

they can perform in the sought after position. It is through the "solid applications of both verbal and non-verbal interviewing techniques" that applicants will be able to emit this message to interviewers (Shemetulskis, 1984, p. 18). Additionally, Penrose (1984) found that both college students and recruiters agreed that the most important activity taking place during the employment interview is the interviewee's opportunity to establish his/her personality and to sell oneself. In essence, it is not "what" students say in the interview, but "how" they say it that will influence the recruiters' judgements (Lumsden & Sharf, 1974).

An excellent way for college students to gain confidence and obtain feedback regarding interview performance is by practicing and rehearsing interviewing styles (Himstreet & Baty, 1984; Vaughn & Darsey, 1987). Stumpf, Austin, and Hartman (1984) have defined the concept of "interview readiness" as "the extent one has relevant skills, and accurate knowledge of past interview performance; has been encouraged and verbally persuaded that future performance will be effective; and has confidence that one is able to perform effectively in interviews" (p. 223). Powell and Kirts (1980) indicated that

> All job applicants are nervous and employers overlook initial flutterings. The only way to minimize nervousness is to eliminate the uncertainty that creates it. Uncertainty disappears as the interview follows a pre-planned pattern. The pre-planned pattern comes from a sound, well-conceived, and carefully

> designed presentation. Getting ready for the interview is a large part of the presentation. (pp. 188-189)

Student applicants who are taught employment interviewing skills and given the opportunity to practice these skills will have a significant advantage, setting them apart from other applicants (Prazak, 1969).

How do college recruiters feel about student interviewees? Vaughn and Darsey (1987) surveyed the opinions of college recruiters regarding student behavior during campus interviews. These researchers reported that 70% of the respondents identified the following behavioral traits as having a negative effect on their perceptions: (a) lack of confidence, (b) failure to elaborate on answers, (c) lack of enthusiasm, (d) uncertainty of type of work prepared for, and (e) failure to set goals (Vaughn & Darsey, 1987). Kinicki and Lockwood (1985) concluded that recruiters seemed to rely upon subjective, impressionistic factors (i.e., interview impression and attraction) rather than on objective, concrete information such as academic achievement and related work experience. However, other researchers have cited undergraduate grade point average, affiliation with a fraternity or sorority, and membership in professional associations as being related to interviewers' perceptions and overall impression of applicants (Campion, 1978). Furthermore, Cohen and Etheredge (1975) found that the performance of applicants in the interview along with

the grade point average correlated with recruiters' decisions, although the age of the applicant was not significantly related. Dipboye (1982) has suggested that the self-fulfilling prophecy manifests itself in the recruitment process when recruiters identify individuals who they consider as "stars" and give them preferential treatment and greater opportunities when hired.

Methods of Teaching Employment Interview Techniques

Studies have been conducted to explore methods of effectively training individuals to conduct employment interviews. Traditionally, instructional interviewing methods have been the lecture-laboratory type which provide a discussion of interviewing tactics followed by a practice interview to further reinforce the learning (King & Behnke, 1985). A workshop approach where students become participants and practice skills is another method often used to teach interviewing techniques (Hollandsworth & Sandifer, 1979; Mathews, Damron, & Yuen, 1985; Walker, 1974). Stevens and Tornatzky (1976), after conducting a study to investigate the effectiveness of a behavioral skills workshop administered to 26 clients from a drug abuse treatment program, concluded that 6 months subsequent to training those who participated in the training were employed in higher paying jobs than their counterparts who did not receive the instruction. The results of Briscoe's

(1983) work using a short term behavioral-based program to teach employment interviewing skills to vocationally handicapped persons showed that participants in the program received higher ratings by their employers during post-training interviews than non-participants. Briscoe's behavioral-based instructional method consisted of a two-hour training session using modeling, role-playing, behavioral rehearsal with performance feedback, and social reinforcement (Briscoe, 1983). The results of this study also indicated that verbal behaviors can be quantified through direct observation (Briscoe, 1983). Speas (1979) compared four instructional techniques to teach prison inmates how to conduct an effective interview. He found that the model exposure plus role playing techniques, and the model-exposure, plus role playing, plus videotaped-feedback methods were the most effective instructional methods (Speas, 1979).

Hollandsworth, Dressel, and Stevens (1977) compared a behavioral skills workshop and a traditional lecture-discussion group approach in an attempt to increase interviewees' effectiveness in employment interviews. They suggested that neither of these methods was most effective, and they have recommended using a model combining the most effective components of a behavioral workshop and a lecture discussion group (Hollandsworth et al., 1977). In a follow-up study, Hollandsworth and Sandifer (1979) developed a

a workshop combining the most effective components of the behavioral workshop and the lecture discussion group method. They found that this type of workshop could be easily employed by counselors as a training procedure and yielded high student satisfaction (Hollandsworth & Sandifer, 1979). Austin and Vines (1980) compared five methods of teaching college students employment interviewing behavior: (a) a didactic approach, (b) a didactic plus a mock interview, (c) a didactic plus watching professionally conducted videotaped interviews, (d) a didactic plus watching a self-videotaped interview with no feedback, and (e) a didactic plus watching a self videotaped interview but receiving feedback. The results of this study showed that the videotape instruction with or without feedback did not increase interview performance whereas the didactic approach did improve interview performance (Austin & Vines, 1980). In 1981, Austin and Grant (1981) compared the same five interview training techniques (i.e., a didactic, a didactic plus a mock interview, a didactic plus a professional videotape, a didactic workshop plus self-videotape with no feedback, and a didactic workshop plus self-videotape with feedback) using as subjects college students identified by college placement counselors as "less marketable" and "more difficult to place" due to poor verbal skills and socially unsophisticated behavior (Austin & Grant, 1981, p. 72). Austin and Grant (1981) found that although the subjects in

the treatment groups performed significantly better than the control group, there were no significant differences in the treatment subjects' interview performance (Austin & Grant, 1981).

Goodall and Goodall (1982) recommended that researchers need to collect employment interviewing behavioral data through observation of interviews. The use of videotaping student interviews and/or viewing a professional videotape of an employment interview for instructional purposes is becoming widely accepted (Austin & Vines, 1980; Chandler, 1984; Gilmore, 1973; Kiradjieff & Stimac, 1975). Using videotaping to conduct research on the employment interview and to collect behavioral data has also become more prevalent and popular with researchers, possibly due to its greater flexibility and low cost (Arvey & Campion, 1982). Hollandsworth, Dressel, and Stevens (1977) in their study comparing a behavioral instructional approach with a traditional lecture-discussion group approach, videotaped the subjects in a simulated job interview prior to, and following each workshop. Arvey and Campion (1982), in their review of the employment interview research, cited the study conducted by Osburn, Timmreck, and Digby (1981), who concluded "that interviewers made accurate discriminations among job candidates on the basis of a videotaped interview when they evaluated the candidates on specific and relevant job dimensions" (p. 297).

Videotaping students engaged in employment interviews, and then replaying the videotape to elicit classroom feedback and discussion has been shown to be an effective teaching tool (Kiradjieff & Stimac, 1975). Videotaping has also been especially useful when attempting to reshape student classroom behavior (Yannone, 1984). As a recruitment tool, videotaping students' employment interviews has been gaining popularity in the corporate sector as recruiters are finding it to be a cost effective and convenient method of making preliminary hiring decisions (Flanagan, 1985).

With the advent of high technology, the availability and low cost of microcomputers, applications of simulation techniques have increased (King & Behnke, 1985), and the use of microcomputers in the area of career counseling and placement has become more popular (Alpert, Pulvino, & Lee, 1985; Johnson, 1985). Teachers have been reported to respond positively to microcomputers. Harmon (1986), in his research investigating business teachers' attitudes toward microcomputers as a teaching tool, indicated that their overall attitude toward computers is positive.

Wagman and Kerber (1984) point out the advantages to computer-assisted guidance counseling when they indicated that "the computer is patient, reliable and efficient, and cannot become overinvolved with the user. And the accessibility of the computer allows users to independently

interact with the machine at their own convenience" (p. 150). Recently there has been an increase in the development of career education microcomputer programs which can be attributed to reduced costs of purchasing microcomputers and their potential for student utilization without substantial investment of the counselor's time (Vacc & Loesch, 1987). Hosie and Smith (1984) indicated that "the relatively inexpensive cost of microcomputers has opened the door for counselor educators to participate in the use of this advanced technological medium for instructional purposes" (p. 176). Overall, microcomputers offer flexibility to counselors in their work, while also contributing to student skill development (Phillips, 1984).

Conclusion

In spite of the microcomputer's instructional potential and the recent development of software programs that teach employment interviewing techniques, the review of the literature yielded no significant studies conducted within the past five years on the use of microcomputers to teach employment interviewing techniques to college students. (Dissertation Abstracts in Education, 1980-1988; ERIC, 1982-1988; Mental Health Abstracts, 1969-1988; Psycho-Info, 1982-1988). The research cited in this chapter substantiates that employment interviewing techniques can be taught and learned by college students (Austin & Vines, 1980) and also

improve college students' employment interviewing performance (Austin & Vines, 1980; Austin & Vines, 1981). Additionally, specific verbal and non-verbal behaviors displayed by applicants during an employment interview have been identified and investigated (Hollandsworth, Kazelskis, Stevens, & Dressel, 1979; Tessler & Sushelsky, 1978; Tschirgi, 1973). These researchers have demonstrated how important the appropriate use of these behaviors can be to attaining a favorable appraisal from the interviewer (Hollandsworth et al., 1979; Tessler & Sushelsky, 1978; Tschirgi, 1973). Identification of these behaviors can help college recruiters find appropriate candidates to fill organizational positions (Goodall & Goodall, 1982) and provide valuable information to career and placement counselors that can be used as a teaching tool in the pragmatics of employment interviewing (Goodall & Goodall, 1982).

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to compare the effects of three instructional methods often used by career and placement counselors to instruct college students in employment interviewing techniques. The three instructional methods compared were (a) counselor-led instruction, (b) microcomputer-assisted instruction, and (c) videotape instruction.

Relevant Variables

The dependent variables under investigation were (a) the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers and the raters, (b) the ratings of the students' behavior displayed in the videotaped mock interviews, and (c) the students' retention of the information as presented in the instructional activities. The independent variables were the methods of teaching employment interviewing techniques to college students. There were four levels of the independent variable: (a) counselor-led instruction, (b) microcomputer-assisted instruction, and (c) videotaped instruction. The control group did not receive any instruction.

Population

The population for this study consisted of 806 students who had completed 60 semester hours or more and were enrolled in full time, undergraduate studies during the spring, 1988 semester at St. Thomas University, located in Miami, Florida. St. Thomas University is one of three private Catholic institutions of higher education in the State of Florida, offering undergraduate, graduate, and Juris Doctor degrees.

Of the 806 students which comprised the population of this investigation, 337 were classified as juniors (i.e., third year of academic studies) and 469 were seniors (i.e., fourth year of academic studies). The third-year class consisted of 54% males and 46% females. The percentage of male and females for the fourth-year class was 44% and 56%, respectively.

St. Thomas has a high enrollment of students of Hispanic descent as approximately 46% of the student population are classified as Hispanics. Forty-two percent of the students enrolled during the spring, 1988 semester in the third-year class were Hispanic. Ten percent of the students in the third-year class were non-Hispanic blacks. The fourth-year class was composed of 52% Hispanics and 5% non-Hispanic blacks.

Sampling Procedure and the Resultant Sample

Random sampling was used to obtain the college students used in this study. A computer generated list of third- and fourth-year students (i.e., students who had completed 60 or more semester hours and were enrolled full time at St. Thomas University during the spring, 1988 semester) was used to select the sample. A letter was sent by the investigator to all the students on the list advising them of their selection for the investigation. The letter asked the students to contact the investigator within seven to ten days if they were interested in participating in the study. A follow-up phone call was placed to those students who did not respond within a week. Those students who indicated an interest in participating were randomly assigned to a treatment group until there were a total of 12 students in each group. The students agreeing to participate in the study also met the following criteria: (a) they had completed 60 semester hours or more at St. Thomas University and were enrolled full time in academic studies, (b) they did not have a long history of professional employment (i.e., three or more positions), and (c) they agreed to participate as subjects in the research.

Procedure and Methodology

A memorandum was written to Dr. Paul Weiser, St. Thomas University's Dean for Academic Affairs, requesting approval

to conduct this investigation (Appendix B). After approval was granted a request was made to the University's Computer Center to obtain a listing of all undergraduate students who had completed 60 semester hours or more and were enrolled full time at St. Thomas University during the spring, 1988 semester. The computer generated list contained the names, addresses, and phone numbers of 298 third- and fourth-year students. The list contained only the names of students who had given their permission to the University's Registrar to release their student information for research purposes.

Due to the small size of the population, all the students listed having local addresses (i.e., students residing on the St. Thomas campus, or living in Dade and Broward counties) were sent letters by the investigator (Appendix C). The letter asked the students to contact the investigator within 7-10 days. As the students responded positively to either the letter or the follow-up phone calls, they were randomly assigned to either of the four groups (i.e., counselor-led instruction, microcomputer-assisted instruction, videotaped instruction, or control group).

Pressures and problems which traditionally beset counseling settings often allow counselors sufficient time to address only immediate concerns of clients (Vacc & Loesch, 1987), and counselors usually can allot students only one-half hour or so of time to instruct them in

employment interviewing techniques. Therefore, each treatment lasted one-half hour.

Immediately following the treatment the subjects were scheduled for their videotaped mock employment interview and randomly assigned to either a female or male interviewer. The subjects all spoke with the investigator regarding the research study and signed the Informed Consent Form (Appendix D). All the subjects were told they were being videotaped in a mock employment interview and were given instructions asking them to conduct the interview as if it were a "real" job interview. They were also informed that they were applying to the fictitious XYZ Company and were asked to choose one of the positions listed on the instruction sheet. They were instructed to conduct the interview as if they were applying for that particular position (Appendix E). The interviewers were "blind" in regard to the group to which the subjects were assigned. All subjects completed a demographic questionnaire (Appendix F), and the Retention Questionnaire (Appendix G).

The two male and female interviewers were knowledgeable in employment interviewing, having an educational and professional background in employment interviewing and placement. The male interviewer held a Bachelor's degree in Personnel Administration and had worked as a personnel supervisor. The female interviewer held a Master's degree in counseling and worked as a career and placement

counselor. The interviewers conducted the mock interviews based on a set of fifteen questions (Appendix H) extracted from the "Most often asked questions in the employment interview" contained in the training instructions for the Four Stages of Interviewing (Career Development Software and Cambridge Products, 1979). Following the completion of each videotaped student interview the interviewer completed the EIRS and made a "mock hiring decision." The interviewers were asked to respond to the question "Would you hire this student?" based on the following five-point, Likert-type scale: (a) "1" Definitely not, (b) "2" Probably not, (c) "3" Possibly may, (d) "4" Probably will, and (e) "5" Definitely will. Prior to conducting their first interview, the interviewers participated in a one and one-half hour training session with the investigator.

Three individuals knowledgeable in employment interviewing and with prior experience in the area of employment interviewing watched the students' videotaped interviews and rated the verbal and non-verbal behaviors displayed by the subjects in the videotaped mock interviews. All of these individuals had Master's degrees in counseling. One of them worked as a vocational rehabilitation counselor in the private sector, counseling and placing industrially injured workers. The other rater was the Assistant Director of Student Development at Nova University, in Davie, Florida, and has counseled undergraduate students in career

development areas. The final rater was the Director of Placement at St. Thomas School of Law.

The raters used the EIRS to rate the subjects' verbal and non-verbal employment interviewing behavior during the videotaped mock interviews. Following the termination of each mock interview, the raters made a "mock hiring decision" based on the same five-point Likert-type scale described previously. The raters were blind as to which of the four groups the subjects were assigned.

The investigator conducted a one and one-half hour training session with the raters. The training focused on the use of the EIRS, and the employment interviewing behaviors under investigation. A glossary was developed (by the investigator) containing descriptions of the behaviors under observation (Appendix I). The glossary was used during the training to assist the raters with the terminology found in the EIRS and with the behaviors being investigated.

Description of Training

The training for the two interviewers consisted of viewing a one-half hour videotape program entitled, The Four Stages of Interviewing, developed by Career Development Software and Cambridge Products (1979b). The interviewers also reviewed the Student Handout (Appendix I) (which outlined the four stages of interviewing) and the 15

interview questions to be asked during the videotaped mock employment interviews. The investigator reviewed each question with the interviewers and instructed them to follow the exact order in which the questions were listed while conducting the mock interviews. Each item on the EIRS was also reviewed with the interviewers so that they understood the meaning of the item and the correct use of the instrument. Finally, the interviewers conducted a mock employment interview with one another. The interviews were videotaped, and that videotape was used in the training administered to the raters. The interviewers also were provided the opportunity to view their respective videotapes and obtained feedback from the investigator.

The three videotape raters also participated in a one and one-half hour training session with the investigator. They watched the 30-minute video of the Four Stages of Interviewing and reviewed the handouts describing the stages. The investigator reviewed the items on the EIRS and the behavior being measured in each item. The glossary of terms developed to assist the interviewers and raters with the terminology used in the EIRS was also reviewed with the raters during the training. The raters practiced using the EIRS by rating the interviewers' behaviors on the sample videotape of the employment interviews conducted by the two interviewers.

To estimate the inter-rater reliability among the raters' behavioral ratings and their mock hiring decisions, the Spearman-rho correlation coefficient was computed for the two sample interviews. A correlation of .98 was obtained between the behavioral ratings and the mock hiring decisions for Interview 1, and .86 was obtained for Interview 2.

Description of Instructional Methods

The three instructional methods under investigation were (a) counselor-led instruction, (b) microcomputer-assisted instruction, and (c) videotape instruction. The content of each of these methods consisted of material from Career Development Software (1979a,b). In the videotape instructional method the subjects viewed the 30-minute videotape, The Four Stages of Interviewing developed by Career Development (1979b). The videotape provided instruction on issues and questions unique to each stage and advice on how to conduct oneself during interviews. The videotape also provided explanations on how to respond to questions likely to be asked during the interview.

There was no instructor interaction with the subjects during the videotape instruction. The instructor came in prior to the instruction to distribute the Student Handout and to turn on the videotape. The instructor returned at the end of the videotape to turn off the television and

distribute and collect the demographic and retention questionnaires. Immediately following the treatment, the subjects went to the St. Thomas Media Center to be videotaped in the mock employment interview intended to last 15 minutes.

The microcomputer-assisted instructional method consisted of 30 minutes of one-to-one student interaction with the software developed by Career Development, The Four Stages of Interviewing--The Micro Program. This software contains the same information on the four stages of interviewing that is contained in the videotape. As in the videotape instruction, there was no instructor interaction other than providing technical assistance on the use of the microcomputer. The instructor turned on the microcomputer for the subjects, inserted the software disk, and distributed the Student Handout. At the end of the 30 minutes the program was finished, and the instructor turned off the computer and gave the subjects the demographic and retention questionnaires to complete. The subjects then proceeded to the St. Thomas Media Center to be videotaped in mock employment interviews.

The 30-minute counselor-led instruction was facilitated by a career counselor from the Career Resources Center at St. Thomas University. During this treatment, the counselor/instructor presented the same material contained in the videotape and software programs. The

counselor/instructor reviewed the four stages of interviewing and questions likely to be asked during the interview. She also assisted the subjects in developing appropriate responses to these questions. During the last 20 minutes of the instruction, a 10-minute, role-played interview was conducted by the counselor/instructor with one of the subjects (Appendix K). Upon completion, the counselor/instructor distributed the demographic and retention questionnaires. The subjects then went to the St. Thomas Media Center to be videotaped in mock employment interviews.

Instrumentation

The Employment Interview Rating Scale (EIRS) was developed using behavioral characteristics displayed in the employment interview previously identified in research by Cohen & Etheredge (1975). Permission was obtained from the Journal of College Placement to use modified items from Cohen and Etheredge's (1975) Employment Interview Checklist (Appendix L). A 5-point, Likert-type scale was applied to the 48 behavioral items selected for the EIRS. A Likert-type scale was used because it is a summated rating scale which will yield a greater variance than a checklist in regards to subjects' attitudes (Issac & Michael, 1971; Kerlinger, 1964).

To clarify the meaning of the items and to avoid sexist language, the investigator changed the wording on those items selected from Cohen and Etheredge's Employment Interview Checklist (1975). The word "applicant" was changed to "interviewee," sexist language was deleted from all the items, and items were re-written from a negative to a positive perspective. Additionally, the behavioral items were categorized into the following "behavioral dimensions" which were constructed and validated by Lumsden and Sharf (1974): (a) academic balance, (b) social balance, (c) judgement, (d) oral presentation, (e) non-verbal behavior, and (f) preparedness for the interview.

To establish content validity, 34 college recruiters who were recruiting at St. Thomas University's Career Day Fair during October, 1987, were asked to complete the recruiters' version of the EIRS. These recruiters were individuals who worked in various areas of personnel or human resources and who have interviewed prospective job applicants on a regular basis. The recruiters were asked to respond on the relevancy to the employment interview of each of the 48 items on the EIRS based on the following five point Likert scale: (a) "1" Highly relevant, (b) "2" somewhat relevant, (c) "3" relevant, (d) "4" not relevant but keep the item, and (e) "5" not relevant at all delete item. The recruiters were also asked to offer their comments or suggestions for additional items (Appendix M).

Twenty-five of the 34 recruiters completed and returned the EIRS to the investigator. A "split-half" reliability using the Spearman-rho (Rank Difference) correlation coefficient was computed on the recruiters' version of the EIRS to estimate the measurement accuracy and internal consistency of the items (Issac & Michael, 1977). The split-half technique was chosen by the investigator so as to avoid the problems associated with re-testing such as the effects of prior practice and item memorization (Blum & Foos, 1986). A correlation coefficient of .93 was obtained using the raw scores of the odd and even items.

Due to the length and ambiguity of some of the items, the recruiters' version of the EIRS was revised by the investigator. Those items which were reported to be "irrelevant or ambiguous" by three or more of the recruiters were deleted from the final version of the EIRS. The item, "The interviewee conveyed a positive attitude" was added to the non-verbal behavioral dimension of the EIRS as suggested by one of recruiters validating the instrument. The mock hiring decision, "Would you hire this applicant," based on the following 5-point Likert-type scale: (a) "1" Definitely not, (b) "2" Probably not, (c) "3" Possibly may, (d) "4" Probably will, and (e) "5" Definitely will, was also added to the EIRS to allow for comparisons between the behavioral ratings and the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers and raters.

Further revision of the EIRS consisted of re-categorizing the items into only two subscale dimensions, verbal and non-verbal behavior. The final version of the EIRS contained a total of 30 items and the mock hiring decision (i.e., the item "Would you hire this applicant") (Appendix A). The directions on the EIRS asked the respondents to review each of the items and determine the extent to which the interviewee, during the mock interview, displayed the behavior(s) identified in the items. All the items were to be answered based on the following Likert-type scale: (a) "1" Definitely not, (b) "2" No, (c) "3" Somewhat, (d) "4" Yes, and (e) "5" Yes, definitely. To estimate the reliability of the instrument following these revisions, the Spearman-Brown correlation coefficient was computed on the final version of the EIRS. The Spearman-Brown correlation coefficient is used to establish reliability after an instrument is lengthened or shortened (Cronbach, 1970). A coefficient of .83 was obtained. The EIRS was scored by totaling the weighted item ratings of the behavioral subscale dimensions and computing a mean score for the entire EIRS and for the sub-scale dimensional areas.

The Retention Questionnaire contained 10 multiple-choice items that covered the major points of the material presented in the videotape and microcomputer program, the Four Stages of Interviewing (Career Development Software and Cambridge Products, 1979a,b). The Retention Questionnaire

was scored by totaling the items answered correctly. A mean score for the experimental groups and the control group was computed.

Experimental Hypotheses

The experimental hypotheses under investigation were

1. There will be no significant differences among the mean scores of the experimental groups and the control group on the EIRS.

2. There will be no significant differences among the mean scores of the experimental groups and the control group on the verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS.

3. There will be no significant differences among the mean scores of the emperimental groups and the control group on the non-verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS.

4. There will be no significant differences among the experimental groups and the control group on the retention scores.

5. There will be no significant relationship between the mock hiring decisions of the raters and the interviewers.

6. There will be no significant relationship between the verbal and non-verbal behavior (as measured by the mean of the total scores of the experimental groups on the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers.

7. There will be no significant relationship between the verbal and non-verbal behavior of the experimental groups (as measured by the mean of the total scores on the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the raters.

8. There will be no significant relationship between the verbal behavior of the experimental groups (as measured by the mean of the total scores on the verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers.

9. There will be no significant relationship between the verbal behavior of the experimental groups (as measured by the mean of the total scores on the verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the raters.

10. There will be no significant relationship between the non-verbal behavior of the experimental groups (as measured by the mean scores on the non-verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers.

11. There will be no significant relationship between the non-verbal behavior of the experimental groups (as measured by the mean scores on the non-verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the raters.

Data Analyses

The research design used in this investigation was a randomized control group, post-test only design (Isaac & Michael, 1971). There were four independent groups having randomly selected and assigned subjects. Three of the groups received the treatment--one of the three instructional methods of employment interviewing. The control group received delayed treatment. No pre-test was administered because randomization allowed the investigator to omit the pre-test (Kerlinger, 1964; Issac & Michael, 1971). According to Issac and Michael (1971).

> The experimenter can omit the pre-test because randomization techniques permit him to declare that at the time of assignment the groups were equal. The probability theory tells him to what extent the randomly assigned subjects in the four groups might have been expected to differ by chance on T, (pre-test) and the test of significance takes account of such differences. (p.42)

Randomized control-group post-test designs control for threats to internal validity in the areas of history, maturation, and pretesting. With this design, no pre-test is administered which could interact with the interventions (Issac & Michael, 1971).

Descriptive statistics were computed on the data obtained from the investigation. Subjects' scores on the EIRS and the Retention Questionnaire were summed and mean scores computed.

Analyses of variance and Pearson Product-Moment correlations were the statistical analyses used to test the null hypotheses under investigation. Scheffé's Tests to test for comparisons between group means was conducted on the rejected null hypothesis.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Researchers have revealed that college students generally are not adequately prepared to conduct an effective employment interview; consequently, they fail to attain the sought after position after graduation (Garis & Hess, 1985; Shemetulskis, 1984; Tschirgi, 1973). Furthermore, the pressures and problems often faced by counselors allow them to address only the immediate concerns of clients (Vacc & Loesch, 1987) thus leaving career and placement counselors with limited amounts of time to instruct college students in employment interviewing techniques.

The purpose of this study was to compare the effects of three, one-half hour, instructional approaches which could be used by career and placement counselors to instruct college students in employment interviewing techniques. The three treatment approaches under investigation were (a) counselor-led instruction, (b) videotape instruction, and (c) microcomputer-assisted instruction. The Employment Interview Rating Scale (EIRS) was developed by the investigator to measure the verbal and non-verbal behaviors displayed by the subjects during a videotaped mock

employment interview following their participation in the treatment. The EIRS was also used to determine whether the verbal and non-verbal behaviors displayed by college students during the employment interview were related to the hiring decisions of the interviewers and raters who watched the videotaped mock interview. A Retention Questionnaire was administered to the subjects to measure the retention of information learned during the instruction. A control group was also used for comparisons.

Analyses of variance and computation of product-moment correlations were used to test the null hypotheses. The acceptable level of significance for all the analyses was set at the .05.

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 48 college students in their junior and senior years of undergraduate study at St. Thomas University, a private Catholic University located in Miami, Florida. Twenty-six of these students were males and 22 were females. Seventy-five percent of the subjects were seniors (i.e., fourth year) while 25% were juniors (i.e., third year). All the subjects were enrolled full time in academic studies and had a diversity of majors.

In Table 1 descriptive statistics of the sample by age are provided. The subjects ranged in age from 21 to 52. The mean age for all the subjects was 24.58.

In Table 2, a breakdown of the subjects' ethnicity is provided. Forty-one percent of the subjects were Caucasian (non-Hispanic), 36% were Hispanic, 19% were black American, 2% were Puerto Rican American, and 2% were of Asian/Pacific Islander ethnicity.

The subjects held a total of 239 jobs since age 16, with a range of 1 to 20 jobs per subject. The mean number of jobs held by all the subjects since age 16 was 5 per subject. Of these, 54 were of a professional nature and directly related to the subjects' majors. The range of the professional jobs held was 0 to 3; with a mean of 1.1 per subject (see Table 3).

As discussed in Chapter III, the subjects were randomly assigned to the counselor-led, microcomputer-assisted, videotape instruction or control group. With the exception of the control group, the subjects were asked (on the Demographic Questionnaire) to indicate their level of satisfaction according to the following scale: (a) "1" Definitely not satisfied, (b) "2" Not satisfied, (c) "3" Somewhat satisfied, (d) "4" Satisfied, and (e) "5" Definitely very satisfied. Descriptive statistics for the subjects' level of satisfaction with the instruction can

Table 1

Sample Size and Descriptive Statistics Breakdown by Age

Sample Group:	Counselor-Led	Microcomputer-Assisted	Videotape	Control
Sample Size:	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00
Age:				
Mean	28.58	23.08	24.00	22.66
S.D.	10.66	1.93	2.92	2.53
Minimum	21.00	21.00	20.00	21.00
Maximum	52.00	27.00	37.00	30.00

Table 2

Breakdown of Subject Ethnicity By Group

Sample Group:	Counselor-Led	Microcomputer-Assisted	Video-tape	Control	Total
Black Am.*	5	1	1	2	9
Asian/Pac.	0	1	0	0	1
Caucasian	5	4	6	5	20
Am.* Indian	0	0	0	0	0
Mexican Am.*	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rican	0	1	0	0	1
Hispanic	2	5	5	5	17
Totals	12	12	12	12	48

*American

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Number of Jobs Held

Sample Group:	Counselor-led	Microcomputer-Assisted	Video-tape	Control
		Jobs Held Since Age 16		
Mean	4.6	5.7	5.0	4.5
S.D.	1.2	2.9	2.0	5.3
Minimum	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Maximum	6.0	10.0	8.0	20.0
		Professional Jobs Held		
Mean	1.2	1.5	.9	.8
S.D.	.8	1.2	1.1	.9
Minimum	0	0	0	0
Maximum	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0

be seen in Table 4. All the subjects indicated that they were satisfied with the instruction received. The mean level of satisfaction expressed by the subjects in the experimental groups was 4.5.

The subjects were asked to complete a ten-item, multiple choice-Retention Questionnaire (Appendix G). Descriptive statistics for the amount of information retained by the subjects following the instruction received can be seen in Table 5. The subjects in the experimental groups performed better on the Retention Questionnaire than the subjects in the control group who received no instruction prior to completing the questionnaire.

Findings Related to the Null Hypotheses

Differences among the three instructional approaches and the control group were examined in terms of the mean scores obtained by the subjects on the verbal and non-verbal dimensions of the EIRS, and on the scores obtained on the Retention Questionnaire. Differences between the hiring decisions of the raters and the interviewers were based on their EIRS ratings of the verbal and non-behavior displayed by the treatment groups during the videotaped mock interview. Findings regarding the null hypotheses are as follows:

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Level of Instruction Satisfaction

Sample Group:	Counselor-led	Microcomputer-Assisted	Videotape
Mean	4.7	4.5	4.2
S.D.	.4	.4	.5
Minimum	4.0	4.0	4.0
Maximum	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Subject Retention

Sample Group:	Counselor-led	Micro-computer Assisted	Videotape	Control
Mean	9.17	9.00	9.58	8.58
S.D.	.72	1.04	.51	.90
Minimum	8.00	7.00	9.00	7.00
Maximum	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant differences among the mean scores of the experimental groups and the control group on the EIRS.

The interviewers were asked to rate the subjects' verbal and non-verbal behavior following the videotaped mock employment interview. The scores were added to obtain a total EIRS score, and mean scores were obtained. The raters were asked to do likewise except that their ratings of the subjects were based on their perceptions of the interviewee after watching videotapes of the mock employment interviews. In Tables 6 and 7 the results of a one-way analysis of variance computed by group of the total mean scores obtained by the subjects on the EIRS is provided. These tables provide the results of both the interviewers and the raters ratings. There were no significant differences in scores between the groups. Based on this finding, Hypothesis 1 was not rejected.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant differences among the mean scores of the experimental groups and the control group on the verbal dimension of the EIRS.

Table 6

Interviewers' Ratings
Analysis of Variance: Total Mean EIRS Scores by Group

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	pr(F)
Group	3	.3363	.1121	.3525	.7897
Error	44	13.9890	.3179	--	--
Total	47	14.3253			

Table 7

Raters' Ratings
Analysis of Variance: Total Mean EIRS Scores by Group

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	pr(F)
Group	3	.4002	.1334	.6989	.5609
Error	44	8.3984	.1908	--	--
Total	47	8.7986			

The attempt here was to test the effect of the instructional treatment on the mean verbal scores obtained by the subjects on the EIRS. To test the hypothesis a one-way analysis of variance was computed. No significant differences between the groups (see Tables 8 and 9) were revealed and the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant differences among the mean scores of the experimental groups and control group on the non-verbal dimension of the EIRS.

The results of a one-way analysis of variance used to test for significant differences between the mean non-verbal EIRS scores obtained by the groups can be seen in Tables 10 and 11. No significant differences were found among the means. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 4: There will be no significant differences among the experimental groups and the control group on the mean retention scores.

The Retention Questionnaire was administered to all the subjects in the experimental groups immediately following the instruction. The control group completed the Retention Questionnaire prior to engaging in the videotaped mock interview and prior to receiving delayed treatment. The

Table 8

Interviewers' Ratings
Analysis of Variance: Mean Verbal EIRS Scores by Group

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	pr(F)
Group	3	.8943	.2981	.5964	.6246
Error	44	21.9917	.4998	--	--
Total	47	22.8860			

Table 9

Raters' Ratings
Analysis of Variance: Mean Verbal EIRS Scores by Group

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	pr(F)
Group	3	1.4188	.4729	1.4315	.2454
Error	44	14.5373	.3303	--	--
Total	47	15.9561			

Table 10

Interviewers' Ratings
Analysis of Variance: Mean Nonverbal EIRS Scores by Group

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	pr(F)
Group	3	.1272	4.2430	.1516	.9250
Error	44	12.3175	.2799	--	--
Total	47	12.4447			

Table 11

Raters' Ratings
Analysis of Variance: Mean Nonverbal EIRS Scores by Group

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	pr(F)
Group	3	.4889	.1629	.7053	.5571
Error	44	10.1660	.2310	--	--
Total	47	10.6549			

results of a one-way analysis of variance to determine whether there were any significant differences between the groups in the amount of information retained by the subjects are found in Table 12. Significant differences were found among the four groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The differences between all the group means were tested using the Scheffé procedure (Roscoe, 1975). The region of rejection for testing comparisons among the means was set at the .05 level. Table 13 provides the magnitude of the pairwise contrasts and the F statistics. Significant differences were found between the means of the videotape group and the control group. The subjects receiving the videotape instruction performed better on the Retention Questionnaire than the control group subjects. There were no other significant differences among the groups.

The relationships between the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers and the raters and the experimental subjects' scores on the EIRS were dealt with in Hypotheses 5 to 8. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients using a one-tailed test with the alpha was set at .05 and 35 degree of freedoms were used to test each of these hypotheses.

Table 12

Analysis of Variance: Mean Retention Scores by Group

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	pr(F)
Group	3	6.1667	2.0556	3.0659	.0377
Error	44	29.5000	.6705	--	--
Total	47	35.6667			

Table 13

Retention Scores: The Magnitude of Pairwise Contrast and the F Statistics

Groups:	vs. Counselor-Led	vs. Microcomputer-Assisted	vs. Videotape	vs. Control
Counselor-Led	--	.1667 (F=.208)	.4166 (F=2.670)	.5834 (F=3.080)
Microcomputer-Assisted	--	--	.5833 (F=3.011)	.4167 (F=1.096)
Videotape	--	--	--	1.0 (F=11.155)*
Control	--	--	--	--

*$p < .05$

Hypothesis 5: There will be no significant relationship between the mock hiring decisions of the raters and the interviewers.

A correlation coefficient of +.41 was obtained which indicates that a significant relationship existed between the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers and the mock hiring decisions of the raters. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected (see Table 14).

Hypothesis 6: There will be no significant relationship between the verbal and non-verbal behavior (as measured by the mean of the total scores of the experimental groups on the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers.

A correlation coefficient of +.93 was obtained between the mean of the total EIRS scores of the treatment groups and the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers (see Table 15). The null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 7: There will be no significant relationship between the verbal and non-verbal behavior (as measured by the mean of the total scores of the experimental groups on the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the raters on the videotaped mock interview.

Table 15 shows that a correlation coefficient of +.76 was obtained between the mean of the total EIRS scores of

Table 14

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation: Raters' and Interviewers' Hiring Decisions

Hiring Decisions	Mean	SD	*r*
Raters	2.86	1.01	--
Interviewers	3.55	1.34	.41*

*$p < .05$

Table 15

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations: EIRS Ratings vs. Hiring Decisions

Variable	Mean	SD	Hiring Decision	
EIRS Ratings			Interviewer	Rater
Interviewers' Ratings				
Verbal	3.8	.67	.89*	_____
Non-Verbal	4.3	.52	.75*	_____
Total	4.1	.55	.93*	_____
Raters' Ratings				
Verbal	3.6	.56	_____	.62*
Non-Verbal	3.9	.46	_____	.63*
Total	3.7	.44	_____	.76*

*$p < .05$, df=35

the experimental groups and the mock hiring decisions of the raters. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 8: There will be no significant relationship between the verbal behavior (as measured by the mean of the total scores of the experimental groups on the verbal dimension subscore of the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers.

Table 15 reveals that a correlation coefficient of +.89 was obtained between the interviewers' ratings on the verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS and their mock hiring decisions. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 9: There will be no significant relationship between the verbal behavior (as measured by the mean of the total scores of the experimental groups on the verbal dimension subscore of the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the raters.

A correlation coefficient of +.62 was obtained between the raters' ratings on the verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS and their mock hiring decisions (Table 15). Hypothesis 8 was rejected.

Hypothesis 10: There will be no significant relationship between the non-verbal behavior (as measured by the mean of the total scores of the experimental groups on the non-verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers.

A correlation coefficient of +.75 was obtained between the interviewers' ratings on the non-verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS and their mock hiring decisions (see Table 15). The null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 11: There will be no significant relationship between the non-verbal behavior (as measured by the mean of the total scores of the experimental groups on the non-verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS) and the mock hiring decisions of the raters.

A correlation coefficient of +.63 was obtained between the raters' ratings on the non-verbal dimension subscale of the EIRS and their mock hiring decisions (Table 15). The null hupothesis was rejected.

The results reported above reveal that both the interviewers and the raters ratings of the verbal and non-verbal behaviors displayed by the subjects during the mock employment interview, (as measured by the EIRS) were related to their mock hiring decisions.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to compare the effects of three instructional approaches used to teach college students employment interviewing techniques. The three instructional treatments under investigation were all one half hour in duration and consisted of counselor-led instruction, videotape instruction, and microcomputer-assisted instruction. A control group was used to make further comparisons among the variables.

The identified variables assessed were the hiring decisions of the interviewers and the raters, the ratings of the students' behaviors during the videotaped mock employment interviews, and the students' retention of the information presented in the instruction. The Employment Interview Rating Scale (EIRS) was developed to rate the subjects' verbal and non-behaviors during the mock interview conducted following the instruction.

The findings revealed that neither of the three instructional methods were more effective than the other in teaching employment interviewing techniques to college students. However, there were significant findings in the retention of information of the treatment group receiving

the videotape instruction. The group that received the videotape instruction retained more information than the control group.

Additionally, significant relationships were found between the verbal and non-verbal behaviors (as measured by the EIRS) displayed by the treatment groups during the videotaped mock employment interview, and the hiring decisions of the interviewers and the raters who watched the videotaped interviews. A positive correlation was found between the hiring decisions of the interviewers and the raters.

Limitations

While this research presents support for the need to continue to find effective methods of instructing college students in employment interviewing; it was limited in its scope as the sample population was selected from a small, private, mainly commuter-student university. Although the sample represented in this study was a diverse one, selecting students from a larger institution may have yielded different results.

Some of the students selected had prior exposure to employment interviewing having previously interviewed to obtain part time college work study positions during their college careers. Although, the students selected for the

sample all indicated they had not held more than three professional jobs related to their major, they all disclosed having had one or more jobs throughout their lifetime. This prior exposure or "practice effect" was difficult to control and could have affected the independent variables.

The research environment was kept as stable and consistent as possible, however, it was a laboratory type setting rather than an actual "personnel office" setting. This could have affected the performance of the students in the mock interview as they were not actually interviewing for a "real job," and may not have taken the mock interview seriously. However, to control for this variable, the subjects were given instructions prior to engaging in the mock interview, and were told to conduct the interview as if they were applying for a "real job."

A potential and continuous problem when working with college students is their lack of attention to keeping scheduled appointments. Often students did not arrive on time for their instruction or called to cancel and/or reschedule; thus causing difficulties in time coordination between the students, the interviewers, the career counselor, and the investigator. This may have had an adverse affect on the results.

The EIRS was an instrument developed to be used in this research. Further validation would be necessary if the instrument were to be used for predictive purposes.

Finally, the Retention Questionnaire may have been too facile and simplistic as the scores for all four groups ranged from 7 to 10. Even though significant findings were found between the experimental groups and the control group; this was expected since the control group received no instruction prior to completing the Retention Questionnaire. It might have been better to have administered the Retention Questionnaire to the control group following the delayed treatment.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that not one of the three instructional methods was more effective than any other. Factors which could have affected the results include the following: (a) length of the instruction, (b) subjects' prior exposure to interviewing, (c) the personalities of the subject and the interviewer, and (d) the laboratory type setting.

The amount of information retained by the students as result of receiving instruction resulted in significant findings. Furthermore, students receiving the videotape instruction retained more information than those students in the control group. This finding could be attributed to the visual and animated presentation of the video instruction wherein simulated "employment interviewing vignettes" were provided as examples in the presentation. No other

significant finding was discovered among the means of the experimental groups for the amount of information retained by the subjects.

The investigator developed the EIRS to measure the verbal and non-verbal behaviors of individuals during the employment interview. The EIRS was used in this study to rate the behaviors displayed by college students during the mock interview. The mean scores on the two subscale dimensions and the total EIRS scores of the subjects were correlated with the hiring decisions of the interviewers and the raters. The hiring decisions of the interviwers and the raters were also correlated.

The verbal and non-verbal behaviors of the college students as measured by the EIRS were found to be positively correlated to the hiring decisions of the interviewers and the raters. The hiring decisions of the interviewers and raters also were positively correlated. Higher correlations were computed between the interviewers ratings and their hiring decisions than for the raters' ratings. This may suggest that the face to face interview may have had a greater impact on the perceptions of the interviewer resulting in the higher ratings. The raters were not affected by the human aspect as they were watching videotapes; which perhaps provided a more objective measure.

Additional findings show that higher correlations were computed between the subjects' verbal EIRS mean scores and the hiring decisions of the interviewers suggesting that verbal behaviors have a greater affect on the hiring decisions of interviewers than the non-verbal behaviors.

Conclusions

Several conclusions may be drawn from the data presented in this study. There were no significant differences between the three instructional methods under investigation (i.e., counselor-led, microcomputer-assisted, videotape, and the control group who received no instruction). However, the college students who received the videotape instruction retained more information about the instruction than those who received no instruction. Using videotape intructional methods may be more effective in helping students learn specific information regarding the interview. The information retained can be useful to them in preparing for the interview process.

The mock hiring decisions of the raters and the interviewers were based on their evaluation of the verbal and non-verbal behaviors displayed by the college students during the videotaped mock employment interview. These hiring decisions were positively correlated. This suggests that recruiters watching videotapes of employment interviews

may arrive at similar hiring decisions as those of interviewers conducting the face to face interviews.

Although significant relationships were found between the behavioral ratings of the subjects on the EIRS and the mock hiring decisions of the interviewers and the raters; further research validating the EIRS is needed to determine whether the instrument can be used effectively to determine the effect of applicant verbal and non-verbal behaviors on interviewers' hiring decisions.

Implications

The conclusions cited above suggest several implications. The verbal and non-verbal behaviors displayed by college students in employment interviewers may have an affect on interviewers' hiring decisions. Therefore, college and career placement counselors can best assist college students by teaching them appropriate employment interviewing behavior and help them correct inappropriate ones.

This research suggests that videotaped presentations may be used effectively to help college students retain information about employment interviewing. College students using this method of instruction are more likely to retain the information than those receiving no instruction.

The results of this study also imply that independent raters knowledgeable in employment interviewing practices can view videotapes of recruitment interviews and make hiring decisions which are significantly related to those made by recruitment interviewers conducting face to face interviews. Recruiters interviewing on college campuses can benefit from videotaping student applicants as videotaping provides a record of the interview which can be brought to the office and viewed by other decision makers. This alternative method of arriving at hiring decisions may provide a more objective approach.

Recommendations for Further Study

As this research failed to identify one of three employment interviewing instructional methods (of one-half hour duration) often used by career placement counselors to teach college students employment interviewing techniques, research investigating the effects of methods of longer duration (i.e, one to hours) is recommended. Other instructional methods to teach college students employability skills (i.e., peer instruction and videotape self-evaluation) may also warrant investigation. In order to effectively and efficiently instruct college students interviewing techniques, it continues to be important for researchers to identify specific behavior(s) which may affect interviewers' hiring decisions. Finally, further

validation of the EIRS to determine its predictive validity for making hiring decision and its generalizability to other settings and populations is recommended.

APPENDIX A
EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW RATING SCALE

DIRECTIONS: REVIEW EACH OF THE ITEMS BELOW AND DETERMINE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE INTERVIEWEE DISPLAYED THE BEHAVIOR(S) IDENTIFIED IN THE ITEM DURING THE EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW. PLEASE BE SURE TO ANSWER ALL ITEMS. USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE:

1	2	3	4	5
DEFINITELY NOT	NO	SOMEWHAT	YES	YES DEFINITELY

****

VERBAL BEHAVIOR

1. Interviewee verbalized that he/she wanted a job related to his/her academic major.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Interviewee had a good vocabulary.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Interviewee gave responses which indicated confidence in his/her ability to succeed.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Interviewee was able to verbalize his/her career goals.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Interviewee verbalized his/her strengths and weaknesses and was able to discuss them openly.

1 2 3 4 5

6. Interviewee was courteous and respectful during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
DEFINITELY NOT	NO	SOMEWHAT	YES	YES DEFINITELY

****

7. Interviewee used proper grammar during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Interviewee made no contradictory statements during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

9. Interviwee stuck to the subject and did not wander off on tangents.

1 2 3 4 5

10. The length of the interviewee's responses fully answered the interviewer's questions.

1 2 3 4 5

11. Interviewee had an audible voice.

1 2 3 4 5

12. Interviewee indicated he/she had researched the organization by asking about company programs and/or policies specific to the organization.

1 2 3 4 5

13. Interviewee asked specific questions about the position for which he/she had applied.

1 2 3 4 5

14. Interviewee did not over-stress money and/or fringe benefits.

1 2 3 4 5

15. Interviewee asked for more information about the company or organization.

1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
DEFINITELY NOT	NO	SOMEWHAT	YES	YES DEFINITELY

****

NON-VERBAL BEHAVIOR

1. Interviewee chewed gum or smoked during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Interviewee ended statements with laughs or giggles.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Interviewee clutched some object and fidgeted with it during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Interviewee maintained eye contact with the interviewer.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Interviewee kept his/her hand over mouth while talking.

1 2 3 4 5

6. Interviewee kept crossing and uncrossing legs.

1 2 3 4 5

7. Interviewee maintained good posture throughout the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Interviewee's facial expressions were appropriate to the conversation during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

9. Interviewee appeared at ease throughout the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
DEFINITELY NOT	NO	SOMEWHAT	YES	YES DEFINITELY

****

10. Interviewee's non-verbal behavior seemed spontaneous and genuine.

1 2 3 4 5

11. Interviewee's non-verbal behavior displayed self-confidence and self-assurance.

1 2 3 4 5

12. Interviewee smiled frequently and appropriately during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

13. Interviewee greeted the interviewer with a firm handshake.

1 2 3 4 5

14. Interviewee was appropriately attired for the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

15. Interviewee came on time for the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

****

HIRING DECISION: Would you hire this interviewee?

1	2	3	4	5
DEFINITELY NOT	PROBABLY NOT	POSSIBLY MAY	PROBABLY WILL	DEFINITELY WILL

COMMENTS:_____

NAME OF STUDENT:_____

NAME OF RATER:_____

APPENDIX B
ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Paul Weiser
Dean, Academic Affairs

FROM: Adriana McEachern
Director of Admissions/Career Services/Alumni

RE: Doctoral Research

DATE: October 30, 1987

****

This is to request your approval to conduct research on campus for completion of my doctoral dissertation. The study I am conducting will compare the effectiveness of three methods of teaching employment interviewing skills to students. I plan to use approximately 80 students who are juniors and seniors. The students will be randomly selected and randomly assigned to four independent groups. Three of the groups will receive the treatment intervention which will be instruction in interviewing techniques in either a didactic workshop, a videotape instructional workshop, or through an individualized micro-computer program. The control group will receive no treatment. Following the treatment interventions the students will be videotaped in a 15-minute mock interview. Independent raters will then rate the students' employment interviewing behavior using the

Employment Interview Checklist which is a Likert scale with characteristics generally displayed in an employment interview. I will be gathering the data during the Spring, 1988 semester and will be glad to submit copies of the results to the University upon completion. Thank you very much for your consideration regarding this matter. Please advise should you need further information.

APPENDIX C
LETTER TO SUBJECTS

Dear (name of student)

Congratulations! You have been randomly selected from the population of third and fourth year students enrolled during the Spring, 1988 semester to participate in a research study being conducted at St. Thomas University. The title of the research study is "Teaching Employment Interviewing Techniques to College Students." It is being conducted to learn more about the employment interview process and how to best teach college students to conduct effective interviews. This research will also fulfill requirements for completion of my doctoral dissertation.

The employment interview is the most widely used method of personnel selection (Cohen & Etheredge, 1975). Very few positions or jobs do not require an employment interview before the final hiring decision is made. Consequently, I believe it is very important for college students facing the job market to know how to conduct an effective employment interview.

Participation in this research study will take only one hour of your time and there are several benefits

which you will obtain from this experience. These benefits include the following:

1. You will receive employment interviewing training so as to prepare you to conduct an effective interview.

2. You will have an opportunity to "practice" conducting an employment interview.

3. If you are in the College Work Study program you will receive one CEC of credit for this experience.

4. You will be given a complete package with information on how to prepare for the employment interview, which includes tips on improving your interviews, appropriate attire for the interview and other relevant information.

5. You will have the opportunity of being a part of an important research project.

Thank you very much for your kind consideration to this matter. Please contact me within the next seven days to advise me of your decision to participate. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

Adriana McEachern M.R.C
Assistant Dean for Student Services
St. Thomas University School of Law

APPENDIX D
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Thank you for your participation in this research study. The purpose of this investigation is to learn more about the employment interview process and how to best teach college students to conduct effective employment interviews. As part of this research you will be randomly assigned to participate in one half hour of employment interviewing instruction. Following this instruction, you will be videotaped in a mock employment interview lasting for fifteen minutes. Following completion of the interview, you will be asked to complete two short questionnaires. Students who are assigned to the control group will receive employment interviewing instruction following the videotaped interview.

There will be no monetary compensation for your participation in this research project. You are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in the project at any time without prejudice. Confidentiality of the questionnaires and videotaped interviews will be strictly maintained. Only the principal investigator and supervisor will have access to the any of the questionnaires. The videotapes will be watched by the

principal investigator and three independent individuals who will act as raters in this project. The videotapes will be erased after completion of this project and the final dissertation defense. I will be glad to answer any questions you might have regarding this research project. I may be contacted at St. Thomas University School of Law, 16400 N.W. 32nd Avenue, Miami, Florida, 33054, (305) 623-2310.

I have read and I understand the procedure described above. I agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description.

Subject	Date
Principal Investigator	Date
Witness	Date

APPENDIX E
STUDENT EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEWING
INSTRUCTIONS

This is a mock employment interview which is part of the study in which you are participating. However, please act as if you were conducting an actual employment interview. You are applying for a position with the XYZ Company (a fictitious company) whose main branch offices are located in downtown Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. The interviewer for the XYZ Company recruits throughout college campuses and comes to St. Thomas University once a year recruiting for one of the positions listed below. Choose one of the positions on the following page. Preferably choose one that is closely compatible with your academic studies, previous work experience, and career interests. Requirements for these positions are a minimum of an Associate degree and a Bachelor's degree upon graduation.

STUDENT EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEWING INSTRUCTION

(Continued)

1. Office Manager
2. Computer Programmer
3. Mental Health Specialist
4. Marketing Representative
5. Accountant
6. Purchasing Agent
7. Communications Specialist
8. Security Manager
9. Biologist
10. Chemical Analyst
11. Assistant Magazine Editor
12. Restaurant Manager
13. Personnel Coordinator
14. Travel Agent
15. Finance Analyst
16. Sports Coordinator
18. Museum Curator
19. Public Relations Director
20. Teacher

APPENDIX F
STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Please answer all of the following items.

NAME:_____

ADDRESS: _____

CITY:_____STATE:_____PHONE #:_____

AGE:_____COLLEGE MAJOR:_____

CLASS STATUS (CHECK ONE): JUNIOR _____SENIOR_____

DATE OF GRADUATION_____

ETHNIC STATUS, (CHECK ONE):

( ) Black/Non-Hispanic

( ) Asian/Pacific Islander

( ) Caucasian/Non-Hispanic

( ) American Indian/Alaskan Native

( ) Mexican American

( ) Puerto Rican American

( ) Hispanic American

Approximately how many (*number of) jobs have you held since age 16?_____How many of these jobs have been of a professional nature and directly related to your college major?_____

Demographic questionnaire, continued

Please circle the type of employment interviewing instruction you receive today?

Microcomputer Videotape Counselor-led

Control group (delayed instruction, indicate type)_____

_____

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the instruction received.

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely Not satisfied	Not Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Satisfied	Definitely Very Satisfied

Thank you very much for your participation and cooperation.

APPENDIX G
RETENTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please choose the best answer for the following questions.

1. The goal of the "Reception/Acceptance stage is to:
   a) create the best possible first impression
   b) tell the interviewer your long term goals
   c) thank the interviewer for the interview
   d) ask the interviewer about company benefits
2. When the interviewee does not know how to answer the interviewer's questions, it is best for he or she to:
   a) fake the answer
   b) admit you don't know the answer
   c) give an excuse for not knowing the answer
   d) answer a previous question
3. The "Your Turn" stage begins when the interviewer asks:
   a) Tell me about yourself?
   b) What skills do you have for this position?
   c) Do you have any questions?
   d) What salary do you expect, should we decide to hire you?

4. During the "Leave/Taking" stage, the interviewee should:
   a) thank the interviewer for the interview
   b) give the interviewer a firm departing handshake
   c) follow-up next day with a thank-you letter
   d) all of the above
5. The interviewee's enthusiasm, non-verbal behavior, and appropriate dress attire are very important to the interviewer during the:
   a) Reception/Acceptance stage
   b) Leave Taking stage
   c) Your Turn stage
   d) Interrogation stage
6. The best way for the interviewee to research the company or firm prior to the interview is by:
   a) asking a friend for the information
   b) researching the company in the Library
   c) asking the interviewer about the company during the interview
   d) calling a competetive company for the information
7. During the "Interrogation" stage, the interviewer wants to know the applicant's:
   a) family background
   b) address and phone number
   c) salary expectations
   d) skills and qualifications for the position

8. During the interview, the interviewer is deciding whether you are right for the company and the position, while you (the applicant) should be:

   a) unsure about your decision
   b) deciding whether you are right for the company/position
   c) deciding whether you will like the boss
   d) deciding how much you are worth

9. The best way to impress the interviewer during the "Your Turn" stage is to:

   a) compliment him/her on their taste in clothing
   b) ask the interviewer about the industry, company or position
   c) ask the interviewer about any openings for his/her job
   d) ask the interviewer how long he/she has been with the company

10. The interviewee can conduct the most effective employment interview by:

   a) having a laissez-faire attitude during the interview
   b) having no prior preparation for the interview
   c) applying for a position for which he/she has no qualifications
   d) knowing how to deliver good answers to questions frequently asked by interviewers

APPENDIX H
INTERVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

Directions: Please ask each of the student interviewees the following questions in the same order as presented here:

1. For what position are you applying?
2. How would you describe yourself?
3. What are you studying in college?
4. How are your studies related to the position for which you are applying?
5. What are your skills and qualifications for this position?
6. What appeals to you about this company?
7. What are your strengths? Your weaknesses?
8. Name your three greatest accomplishments?
9. What are your short term goals? Your long term goals?
10. How do you feel about re-locating?
11. Do you think your grades are a good indication of your academic achievement?
12. Give me three reasons why you think you are the best person for this position?
13. What criteria are you using to evaluate the company for which you hope to work?

14. In what ways do you think you can make a contribution to this company?

15. What motivates you to put forth your greatest efforts?

16. Do you have any questions?

APPENDIX I
RATER GLOSSARY

1. broad education: completing additional studies besides those required by the academic major; taking coursework in the humanities and liberal arts areas; diversified coursework outside of academic major.

2. good sense of humor: the ability to appreciate that which is humorous; to laugh appropriately in humorous situations.

3. confident attitude: self-assured: the attitude of believing and trusting oneself and one's abilities.

4. ability to verbalize career goals: being able to communicate vocational aspirations and objectives.

5. spontaneous and genuine: the ability to act or "be" natural, real, authentic and non-hypocritical.

6. smiling frequently: portraying an enthusiastic attitude by smiling appropriately and maintaining a positive attitude throughout the interview.

7. firm handshake: a handshake that appears to be strong and sure.

8. persistent and aggressive effort: to continue firmly and steadfastly toward achievement of goals despite presented obstacles.

9. relocate: verbalizing willingness to move to another location.

10. proper grammar: the correct usage of the English language as outlined by the syntactic and inflectional rules of that language.

11. contradictory statements: statements which express opposite meanings or intents.

12. brief responses: responses that are too short and do not provide enough information to adequately answer the question.

13. cliches: an expression which has grown stale from overuse.

14. inaudible voice: barely able to be heard.

15. eye-contact: maintaining visual contact with the interviewer.

16. unchanged facial expressions: facial expressions which remain the same and constant throughout the interview and which portray no expressions of feeling.

17. appeared at ease: portraying a comfortable relaxed attitude as opposed to an anxious or nervous attitude.

18. parts of body visibly shaking: trembling and nervous movements of the body displayed by the interviewee.

19. researching the organization: obtaining information about the company.

20. overstressing money and/or fringe benefits: verbalizing about the monetary and beneficial aspects of the position prior to being offered a position with the company.

21. lateness for interview: appearing after the scheduled interview time.

22. positive attitude: portraying an enthusiastic, confident, self-assured attitude; expressing consistent positive remarks and comments rather than verbalizing the negative.

23. appropriately attired: clean, neat, well-groomed and dressed appropriately for the type of position applied for; for a professional position the general rule is a coat and tie for men in a dark color such as navy, gray, brown; for ladies, a suit or a conservative dress in a darker shade, hosiery, low-heeled shoes, lack of excessive jewelry.

Note: Webster's II New Riverside Dictionary, 1984 edition was used as a reference for some of the words listed above.

APPENDIX J
STUDENT HANDOUT:
THE FOUR STAGES OF THE EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW

1. Reception/Acceptance Stage: The goal of this stage is to create the best possible first impression. To achieve this goal, the interviewee should dress appropriately, be punctual, use a firm handshake, maintain good eye contact with the interviewer, exhibit good posture, show enthusiasm, have a copy of the resume, and be polite to the receptionist.

2. Interrogation Stage: The goal of this stage is to leave the first impression that you are skilled, qualified, experienced, and will fit into the organization. To achieve this goal, the interviewee should know and deliver good answers to questions asked by the interviewer.

3. Your Turn Stage: The goal of this stage is to ask intelligent questions that reflect knowledge of the job, the company, industry, and the interviewer. To achieve this goal the interviewee should research the job, the company, the industry, and the product or service that the company provides. Use all available resources including friends, relatives, the library, and the company itself.

4. Leave Taking Stage: The goal of this stage is to leave a lasting positive impression. To achieve this goal, the interviewee should use a firm departing handshake and thank the interviewer for his/her time. Follow-up next day with a Thank-you letter.

APPENDIX K
DESCRIPTION OF TREATMENTS

Counselor-Led Instruction

The Four Stages of Interviewing

I. Process

A. Goals

1. To teach college students employment interviewing techniques so as to prepare them for the employment interview.

2. To familiarize students with the four stages of the employment interview (a) Stage 1, Reception/ Acceptance; (b) Stage Two, Interrogation; (c) Stage 3, Your Turn; and (d) Stage 4, Leave Taking

B. Source of Materials

1. Information presented will be the same as that presented in the Four Stages of the Employment Interview videotape and microcomputer software program developed by Career Development Software (1979).

C. Time Frame

1. One half hour (1/2 hour)

D. Workshop Facilitator

1. Lisa Winslow, Career Counselor at St. Thomas University

E. Workshop Activities

1. Discuss the four stages of the employment interview and review with the students the information on the Student Hand-out, "Ways to Achieve the Four Stages of the Interview.

2. Hand out and review the list of possible questions which may be asked during each stage of the interview and elicit suggested responses from student participants.

3. Role play a mock employment interview (10 minutes). The career counselor will play the role of the interviewer and interview a volunteer from the participants.

Description of the Video-Tape Instruction

The Four Stages of Interviewing--the videotape presents the viewer with interview scenarios or vignettes highlighting the interview process at each stage of the interview. The viewer is presented with possible questions which may be asked of the interviewee by the interviewer during each of the four stages. The viewer is provided with suggestions for appropriate responses to the interviewer's questions. Additionally, the viewer is presented with scenarios taken from actual work settings in various industry areas such as government, the corporate sector, small business, etc. A case study is presented in the videotape and based on the scenarios presented, the viewer

is asked to choose an appropriate course of action to follow.

Description of the Microcomputer-assisted Instruction

The microcomputer program of The Four Stages of Interviewing provides the same information as the videotape and the counselor-led instruction. The program reviews the stages of the interviewing process, reception/acceptance, interrogation, your turn, and leave-taking stages. However, the instructional format is based on an individualized learning approach, in that the computer user is giving a series of questions to answer regarding the information previously presented. The user must attain a minimum competency score equal to 80 points before being able to proceed to the next section. The user can go back and review previous material prior to re-taking the quiz given at the end of each section. The user is reinforced for correct answers with animated cartoon graphics.

APPENDIX L
LETTER ASKING PERMISSION FROM THE JOURNAL OF COLLEGE PLACEMENT

September 15, 1988

Patricia A. Sinnopt, Editor
Journal of Career Planning and Employment
College Placement Services
62 Highland Avenue
Bethlehem, PA., 18017

Dear Ms. Sinnopt,

This is to request a written release to reprint in a modified form items taken from the "Employment Interview Checklist" developed by Cohen and Etheredge (1975), and published in the article, "Recruiting's Main Ingredient," Journal of College Placement, 35, (2), pps. 75-77. I am using the "Employment Interview Checklist" as a model for the "Employment Interview Rating Scale" an instrument I developed as part of my doctoral dissertation entitled, "Teaching Employment Interviewing Techniques to College Students."

Thank you very much for your anticipated response to this request. Please feel free to contact me at (305) 623-2310, should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Adriana McEachern M.R.C.
Assistant Dean for Student Services

APPENDIX M
EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW RATING SCALE RECRUITERS' VERSION

DIRECTIONS: REVIEW EACH OF THE ITEMS BELOW AND CIRCLE THE ITEM NUMBER WHICH BEST CORRESPONDS. USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE AS A GUIDELINE:

1	2	3	4	5
HIGHLY RELEVANT	SOMEWHAT RELEVANT	RELEVANT	NOT RELEVANT FOR ME BUT KEEP ITEM	NOT RELEVANT AT ALL DELETE ITEM

****

ACADEMIC BALANCE

1. Interviewee attempted to obtain a broad education by taking courses other than those required of his/her academic major.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Interviewee verbalized that he/she wanted a job related to his/her academic major.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Interviewee made excuses about unfavorable aspects of his/her school or employment record.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Interviewee had an unusually good vocabulary.

1 2 3 4 5

SOCIAL BALANCE

1. Interviewee expressed his/her life goals during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Interviewee participated in outside activities and organizations.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Interviewee displayed a good sense of humor.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Interviewer introduced himself/herself to the interviewer without the interviewer having to introduce himself/herself first.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Interviewee gave responses which indicated confidence in his/her ability to succeed.

1 2 3 4 5

6. Interviewee was able to verbalize his/her career goals.

1 2 3 4 5

7. Interviewee admitted his/her weaknesses and discussed them openly.

1 2 3 4 5

SOCIALLY RESPONSIVE

1. Interviewee appeared spontaneous and genuine.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Interviewee appeared self-confident and self-assured.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Interviewee smiled frequently and appropriately during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Interviewee greeted the interviewer with a firm handshake.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Interviewee used "yes sir/mam" or "no sir/mam," indicative of common courtesy.

1 2 3 4 5

JUDGMENT

1. Interviewee related instances of achievement by persistent and aggressive effort.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Interviewee accounted for factors which had lowered his/her grades.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Interviewee indicated he/she would relocate if it would improve the chances for obtaining the job.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Interviewee spoke unfavorably of previous employers.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Interviewee used profanity during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

ORAL PRESENTATION

1. Interviewee used proper grammar during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Interviewee verbally overwhelmed the interviewer.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Interviewee made contradictory statements during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Interviewee ended statements with laughs or giggles.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Interviwee stuck to the subject and did not wander off on tangents.

1 2 3 4 5

6. Interviewee's responses were too brief to fully answer questions completed.

1 2 3 4 5

7. Interviewee used cliches to excess.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Interviewee had an almost inaudible voice.

1 2 3 4 5

NON-VERBAL BEHAVIOR

1. Interviewee used hand gestures to supplement his/her verbal responses.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Interviewee chewed gum or smoked during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Interviewee clutched some object and fidgeted with it during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Interviewee kept eye contact with the interviewer.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Interviewee kept his/her hand over mouth while talking.

1 2 3 4 5

6. Interviewee kept crossing and uncrossing legs.

1 2 3 4 5

7. Interviewee maintained good posture.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Interviewee's facial expressions did not change durinG the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

9. Interviewee appeared at ease throughout the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

10. Interviewee's hands or other parts of the body were visibly shaking during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

11. Interviewee perspired noticeably during the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

PREPAREDNESS FOR INTERVIEW

1. Interviewee indicated he/she had researched the organization by asking about company programs and/or policies specific to the organization.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Interviewee asked specific questions about the position and the organization.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Interviewee referred to the interviewer's organization by the wrong name or mispronounced the name.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Interviewee over-stressed money and/or fringe benefits.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Interviewee had no specific work experience related to the position for which he/she had applied.

1 2 3 4 5

6. Interviewee was late for the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

7. Interviewee asked for more information about the company or organization.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Interviewee was appropriately attired for the interview.

1 2 3 4 5

****

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS:_____

_____

_____

REFERENCES

Alpert, D., Pulvino, C.J., & Lee, J.L. (1985). Computer applications in counseling: Some practical suggestions. Journal of Counseling and Development, 63, 522-534.

Anderson, C.W. (1960). The relation between speaking times and decision in the employment interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 44, 267-268.

Arvey, R.D. (1979). Unfair discrimination in the employment interview: Legal and psychological aspects. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 736-765.

Arvey, R.D., & Campion, J.C. (1982). The employment interview: A summary and review of recent research. Personnel Psychology, 35, 281-320.

Austin, M.F., & Grant, T.N. (1981). Interview training for college students disadvantaged in the labor market: Comparison of Five Instructional Techniques. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 72-75.

Austin, M.F., & Vines, H. (1980). Interview training: Which method works best? Journal of College Placement, Fall, 56-60.

Azrin, N.H., & Philip, R.A. (1979). The job club method for the job handicapped: A comparative outcome study. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 23, 144-155.

Babbitt, L.V., & Jablin, F.M. (1985). Characteristics of applicant's questions and employment screening interview outcomes. Human Communication Research, 11 (4), 507-535.

Baron, R.A. (1986). Self-presentation in job interviews: When "there can be too much of a good thing." Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 16 (1), 16-28.

Blum, M.L., & Foos, P. (1986). Data gathering: Experimental methods plus. New York: Harper & Row.

Briscoe, R.V. (1983). A behavioral-based program for teaching employment interviewing skills to vocationally handicapped persons. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 07-B.

Bugental, J.F.T. (1953). Explicit analyses of topical concurrences in diagnostic interviews. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 9, 3-6.

Campion, M.A. (1978). Identification of variables most influential in determining interviewers' evaluations of applicants in a college placement center. Psychological Reports, 42, 947-952.

Career Development Software, Inc. (1979a). The four stages of interviewing--the micro-program [Computer Program]. Vancouver, Wa.

Career Development Software, Inc. (1979b). The four stages of interviewing [Videotape]. Vancouver, Wa.

Chandler, J.B. (1984). Move over MTV: Videotaped interviews as an educational medium. Media and Methods, 21, 20 +.

Cohen, B.M., & Etheredge, J.M. (1975). Recruiting's main ingredient. Journal of College Placement, 35(2), 75-77.

Cohen, S.L., & Bunker, K.A. (1975). Subtle effects of sex role stereotypes on recruiters hiring decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 566-572.

Cronbach, L.J. (1970). Essentials of psychological testing (3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Dennis, D.L. (1984). Are recruitment efforts designed to fail? Personnel Journal, 60-64.

Dipboye, R.L. (1982). Self-fulfilling prophecies in the selection-recruitment interview. Academy of Management Review, 7, 579-586.

Dipboye, R.L., Arvey, R.D., & Terpstra, D.E. (1977). Sex and physical attractiveness of raters and applicants as determinants of resume evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 3, 288-294.

Downs, C.W. (1969). Perceptions of the selection interview. Personnel Administration, 32, 8-23.

Drake, L.R., Kaplan, R.H., & Stone, R.A. (1972). How do employers value the interview? Journal of College Placement, 32, 47-51.

Feldman, D.C., & Arnold, H.J. (1987). Individual reactions to interviewer behaviors. Journal of Employment Counseling, 24 (1), 30-31.

Flanagan, W.G. (1985, November). Interview . . .Take one! Interviewing videotape. Forbes, pp. 244-246.

Garis, J.W., & Hess, H.R. (1985). A career interview program for liberal arts students seeking business careers. Journal of College Placment, 45, 39-42.

Gilmore, D.C., Beehr, T.A., & Love, K.G. (1986). Effects of applicant sex, applicant physical attractiveness, type of a rater, and type of job on interview decisions. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59 (2), 103-109.

Gilmore, R.G. (1973). Videotaping the real interview. Journal of College Placement, 33 (3), 52-58.

Goodall, D.B., & Goodall, H. L. (1982). The employment interview: A selective review of the literature with implications for communications research. Communications Quarterly, 30 (2), 116-122.

Grundfest, S.F. (1985, Special Edition). The hiring process: How it works. Business Week's Guide to Careers, pp. 29-32.

Hafer, J.C., & Hoth, C.C. (1980, July). Research finds students misinformed on hiring criteria. Marketing News, pp. 18-19.

Hakel, M.D., & Washburn, P. (1973). Cues and verbal content as influences on impressions formed after simulated employment interviews. Journal of Applied Psychology, 58, 140-173.

Hanna, J.V. (1950). Estimating intelligence by interview. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 10, 420-430.

Harmon, G.D. (1986). Teachers' attitudes toward microcomputers as a teaching tool. Microcomputers, 61 (8), 341-344.

Herr, E. (1977). Research in career education: The state of the art. Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education Publications.

Himstreet, W.C., & Baty, W.M. (1984). Business Communications (7th ed.). Boston: Kent.

Hollandsworth, J.G., Dressel, M.E., & Stevens, J. (1977). Use of behavioral versus traditional procedures for increasing job interview skills. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 503-510.

Hollandsworth, J.G., Kazelskis, R., & Dressel, M.E. (1979). Relative contributions of verbal articulative and non-verbal communication to employment decisions in the job interview setting. Personnel Psychology, 32, 359-367.

Hollandsworth, J.G., & Sandifer, B.A. (1979). Behavioral training for increasing effective job-interviewing skills: Follow-up and evaluation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26, 448-450.

Hopper, R., & Williams, F. (1973). Speech characteristics and employability. Speech Monographs, 40, 296-302.

Hosie, J.W., & Smith, C.W. (1984). Piloting courseware. Counselor Education and Supervision, 24 (2), 176-185.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W.P. (1971). Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego: Robert R. Knapp.

Johnson, R.G. (1985). Microcomputer-assisted career exploration. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 33, 296-304.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

King, P.E., & Behnke, R.R. (1985). Teaching interviewing skills by electronically mediated simulations. Education, 19, 44-48.

Kinicki, A.J., & Lockwood, C.A. (1985). The interview process: An examination of factors recruiters use in evaluating job applicants. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 26 (2), 117-125.

Kiradjieff, E.J., & Stimac, M. (1975). Videotaping. Journal of College Placement, 35 (4), 67-68.

Liden, R.C., & Parsons, C.K. (1986). A field study of job applicant interview perceptions, alternative opportunities, and demographic characteristics. Personnel Psychology, 39, 109-122.

Lumsden, H.H., & Sharf, J.C. (1974). Behavioral dimensions of the job interview. Journal of College Placement, 34, 63-66.

Mathews, R.M., & Fawcett, S.B. (1977). Community applications of instructional technology: Training low-income proctors. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 10, 747-754.

Mathews, R.M., Damron, S.W., Yuen, C.K.K. (1985). A seminar in job-finding skills. Journal of Employment Counseling, 22, 170-173.

Mathews, R.M., Whang, P.L., & Fawcett, S.B. (1984). Building the capacities of job candidates through behavioral instruction. Journal of Community Psychology, 12, 123-129.

Mayfield, E.C. (1964). The selection interview: A reevaluation of published research. Personnel Psychology, 17, 239-260.

Moffat, T.L. (1979). Selection interviewing for managers. New York: Harper & Row.

Oppenheim, A.N. (1966). Questionnaire design and attitude measurement. New York: Basic Books.

Penrose, J.M. (1984). A discrepancy analysis of the job-getting process and a study of resume techniques. Journal of Business Communication, 21 (3), 5-15.

Phillips, S.D. (1984). Issues and limitations: Contributions and limitations in the use of computers in counselor training. Counselor Education and Supervision, 24 (2), 186-192.

Plutchik, R. (1968). Foundations of experimental research. New York: Harper & Row.

Powell, R.C., & Kirts, D.K. (1980). Career Services Today. Bethlehem, PA: College Placement Council.

Prazak, J.A. (1969). Learning job seeking interview skills. In J.D. Krumboltz & Thoresen, C.E. (Eds.), Behavioral counseling: Cases and techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Roderick, J.C. (1985). Interviewing: Don't underestimate its importance. Business Education Forum, 39 (4), 7-8.

Roscoe, John T. (1975). Fundamental research statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Rynes, S.L., Heneman, H.G. III, & Schwab, D.P. (1980). Individual reactions to organization recruiting: A review. Personnel Psychology, 33, 529-542.

Rynes, S.L., & Miller, H.E. (1983). Recruiter and job influences on candidates for employment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 147-154.

Schmitt, N. (1976). Social and situational determinants of interview decisions: Implications for the employment interview. Personnel Psychology, 61, 184-192.

Schmitt, N., & Coyle, B.W. (1976). Applicant decisions in the employment interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 184-192.

Schwartz, Y.V. (1987). Using the life skills model in a communication curriculum on employment interviewing for adult baccalaureates. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48/07-A.

Shemetulskis, C.A.M. (1984). Selling you. An excerpt from The omega formula--A specialized guide to winning the employment game. Detroit: AMS Detroit Chapter.

Speas, C.M. (1979). Job-seeking interview skills training: A comparision of four instructional techniques. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 12, 13-22.

Sperber, Z., & Adlerstein, A.M. (1961). The accuracy of clinical psychologists estimates of interviewees' intelligence. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 25, 521-524.

Springbett, B.M. (1958). Factors affecting the final decision in the employment interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 25, 8-17.

Stevens, W. & Tornatzky, L. (1976). The effects of a job-interview skills workshop on drug-abuse clients. Journal of Employment Counseling, 13, 156-163.

Stumpf, S.A., Austin, E.J., & Hartman, K. (1984). The impact of career exploration and interview readiness on interview performance and outcomes. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 24, 221-235.

Tessler, R., & Sushelsky, L. (1978). Effects of eye contact and social status on the perception of a job applicant in an employment interviewing situation. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 13, 338-347.

Tschirgi, H.D. (1973). What do recruiters really look for in candidates? Journal of College Placement, 33, 75-79.

Tullar, W.L., Mullins, T.W., & Caldwell, S.A. (1979). Effects of interview length and applicant quality on interview decision time. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 669-674.

Ulrich, L., & Trumbo, D. (1965). The selection interview since 1949. Psychological Bulletin, 63, 110-116.

Vacc, N., & Loesch, L. (1987). Counseling as a profession. Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.

Vance, R.J., Kuhnert, K.W., & Farr, J.L. (1978). Interviewing judgments: Using external criteria to compare behavioral and graphic scale ratings. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22, 279-294.

Vaughn, J., & Darsey, N. (1985). The campus interview: Are seniors properly prepared? Journal of Business Education, 60 (8), 342-346.

Vaughn, J., & Darsey, N. (1987). Negative behavior factors in the employment interview: Interviewer opinions and observations. The Technical Writing Teacher, 14, 208-218.

Wagman, M., & Kerber, K.W. (1984). Computer-assisted counseling: Problems and prospects. Counselor Education and Supervision, 24, 142-153.

Wagner, R. (1949). The employment interview: A critical summary. Personnel Psychology, 2, 17-46.

Walker, B.J. (1974). Approaches to job hunting workshops. Journal of College Placement, 34 (2), 66-71.

Wanous, J.P. (1980). Organizational entry: Recruitment, selection, and socialization of newcomers. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Wexley, K.N., Fugita, S.S., & Malone, M.P. (1975). An applicant's non-verbal behavior and student-evaluators' judgments in a structured interview setting. Psychological Reports, 36, 391-394.

Wiersma, U., & Latham, G.P. (1986). The practicality of behavioral expectation scales and trait scales. Personnel Psychology, 39, 619-629.

Yannone, D.S. (1984). Videotaping to improve classroom management. Media and Methods, 21, 21-23.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Adriana Garcia McEachern is the Assistant Dean for Student Services at St. Thomas University School of Law and is an adjunct professor in the counseling program at St. Thomas University. Prior to her employment at St. Thomas University, she maintained a private practice in Gainesville and Miami, counseling mental health and rehabilitation clients. She has worked as a counselor and supervisor for Florida's Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services in the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Ms. McEachern received the Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Florida in 1971, and the Master of Rehabilitation Counseling in 1973, also from the University of Florida. She was awarded the Ph.D. degree in counselor education from the University of Florida in August 1989.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Paul J. Wittmer, Chairman
Professor of Counselor Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

James J. Joiner
Associate Professor of Rehabilitation Counseling

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Janet J. Larsen
Professor Emeritus of Counselor Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August 1989

Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
3 1262 08285 276 4